



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF  
2700  
#7  
11-15-02  
DW

In re Applicant:

David K. Vavro et al.

Serial No.: 09/465,634

Filed: December 17, 1999

For: Digital Signal Processor Having a  
Plurality of Independent Dedicated  
Processors

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Art Unit: 2183

Examiner: Tonia L. Meonske

Atty Docket: ITL.0286US  
P7814

Box AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED  
NOV 15 2002  
Technology Center 2100

REPLY TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the final rejection mailed October 29, 2002, reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Claim 15 was rejected on the grounds that the word multi-cycled is indefinite. With respect to the objection to the term multi-cycled mathematical processor, a multi-cycle element is explained on page 24, lines 20-22. There it is explained that a multi-cycle operation may be spread over two or more clock cycles. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

With respect to the argument that in essence mathematical processor simply means any processor, it is clear that this cannot be so since mathematical processor is a well known term of art. Clearly mathematical processors are processors devoted to doing mathematical operations such as add and subtract. See, e.g., page 5, lines 17-24. This understanding is further supported by the attached academic paper. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Date of Deposit: November 8, 2002

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Washington DC 20231.

*Cynthia L. Hayden*  
Cynthia L. Hayden